

Is the South ready for restoration?

IS THE SOUTH READY FOR RESTORATION?

After four years of costly and triumphant war, the question is now before the people whether we shall throw away or secure the results for which that war was waged unto its bitter end. A majority of Congress, as the legislative branch of the government, has pronounced in favor of requiring such guarantees for the future as may be necessary to insure to our children the blessings for which we have made such painful and weary sacrifices. In this, Congress has believed that it was responding to the wishes of its constituency, and it is for that constituency to declare through the ballot-box whether or not Congress has been mistaken. A weightier decision never was in the hands of a free people, and it behooves them to ponder well the facts of the case before they give their verdict.

The Question at Issue.

Stripped of irrelevant externals, the question to be decided is simply whether or not the States lately in rebellion shall be at once and without further probation admitted to the enjoyment of full political rights as equal members in the common government. As, in such case, they would hold the balance of power between the Union and Democratic parties, they would exercise not only a share of power proportioned to their numbers, but an absolute controlling influence which would determine the character of our legislation and our institutions for the future, until some misgovernment should lead to another catastrophe as awful as that from which we are just emerging. It is therefore of the last importance that we should ascertain, as correctly as possible, the spirit which now animates them, that we may estimate the manner in which would be exercised the control over the destinies of the Republic, which we should be thus entrusting to those who have scarcely as yet desisted from their desperate efforts to destroy it.

2

The Position of the President.

Fortunately, Mr Johnson has so frankly defined his position and purposes that neither his former friends nor his former enemies can mistake or misrepresent them.

In the Democratic celebration held at Dayton, Ohio, in honor of the veto of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, Mr. Vallandigham, in praising the President, remarked that—

"He had a slight suspicion that just now a political draft on the White House bearing his (Mr. V.'s) name would be as readily honored as one bearing the name of Stevens, Sumner or Schenck." Of the President's speech of the 22d, he said it was a most timely speech, showing not only that he "meant to fight the infernal Thugs who have arrayed themselves against his policy," but that "he was one of the half dozen men in the United States who understood that the devil of fanaticism is to be fought with fire. He had a firm hope that the President would go on as he had begun."

With equally unerring instinct, the Philadelphia Age, a consistent apologist for Southern treason, in its issue of Feb. 21st, stated—

"We have not abandoned or modified a single honest opinion that it might be made to harmonize with a declaration of the Executive. We have not applauded him merely because his policy was calculated to vindicate the wisdom of the constitutional and conservative views held by the Democratic party. He has not acted as a partizan, nor have we sought to appropriate him as one. We have been no swifter to speak his praise than he has been to do deeds which justify it."

And in the South his name is coupled with that of Jefferson Davis, as a leader, to be honored and revered. In the Mobile Daily Times, of April 25th, there is a report of a dinner of the Mobile Cadets, at which

"The second regular toast was 'The President of the United States.' This was received with deafening cheers, three times three, and every loyal breast glowed with pride, as the glorious name of Andrew Johnson was re-echoed throughout the vast assemblage. When this first explosion had subsided, Col. John Forsyth rose to respond to the toast. These remarks were received with unanimous applause, and the third regular toast was then read: 'Jefferson Davis and his Speedy Liberation.'

"Admiral Raphael Semmes, the guest of the sad, yet pleasant feast, was called on in answer to the toast, 'Our Honored Guest.'

"The Admiral, in felicitous terms, and with a dubious smile on his lips, spoke of the flattering but rather pressing invitation he had received to visit Washington on 'private business.' . . . He said that, conscious of having at no time violated the usages of war, he felt strong in his innocence, but as a resigned Christian, was submissively bowing his head under the passing storm.

"He was soon encouraged by his counsel, who had almost daily access to the President, and from him came words of hope which soothed his mental torments at being separated from his beloved family and devoted friends.

"He dwelt on the liberality of the President, on the difficulties which assailed him, of the perils of his situation, surrounded by the hostile array of radicals and demagogues, but yet expressed undying faith in his firmness, his courage, his talent, and his final triumph over the enemies of the country and constitutional freedom.

"To the President, and to him alone, had the Admiral appealed for justice, and to him alone was he indebted for that tardy justice which, however, the momentous events of the last period could not allow to be rendered him sooner."

3

Neither Democrats nor Rebels are wasting their praise and their support. On the 22d of February, a motley crowd of Democrats and reconstructed rebels assembled in Grover's Theatre, in Washington, and adopted a series of resolutions which embodied the most advanced doctrines of the Copperheads:

" Resolved, That . . . any delinquent State, from the moment it returns to its allegiance, and resumes its rightful position as a member of the Federal Government, becomes entitled to the exercise of all its rights under the Constitution, including that of being represented in each branch of Congress, which it enjoyed before the commission of its offence.

" Resolved, That the only lawful ground on which any member of either House of Congress can be prevented from taking his seat on an equal footing with any other member, must be that his election, or the returns thereof, have not been in accordance with law, and that in deciding upon such qualifications none other can be considered than those prescribed in the Constitution of the United States."

The meeting adjourned in a body to lay these resolutions before Mr. Johnson, who accepted them as "complimentary to the policy which has been adopted by the administration, and has been steadily pursued since it came into powers" and he proceeded to define his position still more clearly:

"When those who rebelled comply with the Constitution; when they give sufficient evidence of loyalty; when they show they can be trusted; when they yield obedience to the law that you and I acknowledge obedience to, I say extend to them the right hand of fellowship, and let peace and union be restored. . . . I am for admitting into the councils all the representatives who are unmistakably and unquestionably loyal. A man who acknowledges allegiance to the Government, and who swears to support the Constitution, must necessarily be loyal. A man cannot take that oath in good faith unless he is loyal. "

The oath of allegiance which was the sport of every guerilla in Virginia and Kentucky and Missouri; the oath of allegiance which, a dozen times repeated, had never caused Davis and Cobb and Breckenridge and Floyd and Slidell to shrink from the work of overturning a government of which they formed part; the oath of allegiance from which they hold that they may at any time be released by the action of their states; the oath of allegiance which sits so lightly on the conscience of a Southern gentleman that General Lee could not recollect whether he had ever taken it to the Confederacy or not—this oath of allegiance is the sole guarantee to be exacted of unrepentant rebels claiming a right to control the Government which they had failed to subvert in arms.

And Mr. Johnston thus proceeds to argue the question:

“The Constitution expressly provides that no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate; and it also provides that each State shall have at least one representative in the House of Representatives. But yet the position is taken that certain States shall not be represented. We impose taxes upon them; we send our tax-gatherers into every region and portion of the States. These people are fit subjects of government for the collection of taxes, but when they ask to participate in the legislation of the country, they are met at the door and told no, you must pay taxes, you must bear burdens of government, but you cannot participate in its legislation which is to affect you through all time to come. Is this justice? Is it fair?”

4

In his veto of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, he had already asserted that the authority of each House to determine the qualifications of its own members “cannot be construed as including the right to shut out, in time of peace, any State to the representation to which it is entitled by the Constitution at present,” and he proceeded to declare that most, if not all, of the States lately in rebellion, “have already been fully restored and are to be deemed as entitled to enjoy their constitutional rights as members of the Union.”

These are the views avowed by the President, the Democrats and the reconstructed rebels. They have thus far been successfully withstood by the Union majority of Congress, supported by the loyal masses who carried the war to a triumphant issue. It is for the people to say whether that resistance shall be withdrawn or not.

The Duty of the North.

In considering this momentous question, it is idle to speculate on the various theories as to the exact legal status of the States lately in revolt. Whether they are still in the Union as States, or whether they have ever been out, or whether they are reduced to the condition of territories, may be an

interesting subject of debate for constitutional lawyers, but is of little practical importance. Mr. Lincoln, with his rare natural sagacity, wisely brushed all such cobwebs aside when he pronounced that they were out of their practical relations to the Union, and that the problem was how to get them back with due regard to the common safety.

In considering this, the sole question should be whether those States are in a temper to permit them to exercise, for the advantage of the whole country, the enormous power which the state of parties would place in their hands. No feelings of enmity provoked by a causeless rebellion should be allowed to sway our judgment. They are our brethren; fate has indissolubly united our destinies by planting us in a territory which admits of no natural division. For good or for evil we must dwell together, and he who would wantonly create or maintain ill-feelings towards those who have been so fearfully punished for the crime of 1861, is an enemy to his race. If they repent; if they turn for forgiveness to the Government whose ruin they madly sought; if they abjure the heresies which precipitated such miseries upon us all; if they frankly accept the situation, burn their false idols and resolve to be as energetic and persistent in upholding as they were in destroying; if they transfer their allegiance from the narrow boundaries of particular States to the wider claims of a glorious nationality; if they admit past errors; if they are willing to cultivate the kindly and fraternal feelings for us which are so confidently claimed of us for them—then we will joyfully bury the hatchet, welcome them back to their places in the capitol of the nation, and allow no memory of the past to sully the bright prospect of the future.

5

This is then the point on which hinges everything else. The President, the Democracy and the leaders of the late Confederacy affirm vehemently that the lately rebel states are in that fraternal and loyal frame of mind that renders longer exclusion both unjust and impolitic. Congress, which has laboriously examined the subject, feels much less confident. Let us endeavor to ascertain from Southern organs of opinion which is most nearly right.

Tennessee.

If we can conceive President Johnson to be familiar with the condition of any portion of the South, it must be with that of his own State, which he ruled as military governor for two years; and if there is any portion of the South which can be trusted it is Tennessee, Where unionism never ceased to struggle against treason, and where long possession by the Federal forces apparently gave time to stamp out the embers of rebellion. In his Freedmen's Bureau veto message, the President thus pleaded the cause of his State:

"The State of Tennessee, for instance, whose authorities engaged in rebellion, was restored to all her constitutional relations to the Union by the patriotism and energy of her injured and betrayed people. Before the war was brought to a termination, they had placed themselves in relation with the general government, had established a state government of their own, and as they were not included in the Emancipation Proclamation, they, by their own act, had amended their constitution so as to abolish slavery within the limits of their State. I know no reason, for example, why the State of Tennessee should not fully enjoy all her constitutional relations to the United States."

To deprive ourselves of the coöperation of such a community would surely seem to be a wrong, and yet when we hear of the authorities of Memphis siding with a bloodthirsty mob in the indiscriminate slaughter of unarmed negroes, and the conflagration of schoolhouses and churches, we begin to doubt whether the people of Tennessee are yet in a frame of mind to govern themselves or to take part in governing us. These doubts are not lessened on finding that Governor Brownlow, but a few weeks before Mr. Johnson penned his veto message, remarked in a speech at Nashville, on the occasion of opening a colored school there:

"I advise the teachers, male and female, to be exceedingly prudent and cautious, and do nothing offensive to the predominant party here.

"You may think it a little strange that I give such counsel. I do it because if Gen. Thomas were to take away his soldiers, and pull up stakes and leave here, *you would not be allowed to occupy this schoolroom a week; not a week!* and if Gen. Thomas and his military throngs were to go away and leave us, *this Legislature, at the head of which I am placed, would be broken up by a mob in forty-eight hours.*

"Our high civil and military functionaries may travel through the South hurriedly and otherwise, and go back to Washington and report that all is well and reconstructed; and those of you who are green enough to believe it, can believe it, but pardon me when I tell you that I don't believe a word of it.

"Had a man been placed here of less prudence, less goodness of temper, less sense, and less sense of justice than Gen. Fisk, this institution and this Bureau 6 would have failed; and he may console himself to-day, that, if our blessed Saviour were to come to Davidson County, with shoulder-straps on, and three or four stars on his shoulders, and bring with him a military staff of the old apostles, he could not give satisfaction to the rebels of Davidson County."

Possibly, Governor Brownlow's rugged unionism may be too uncompromising. Let us then see what are the opinions of the Hon. B. W. Stokes, one of the Tennessee members elect, the unconstitutional denial of whose seats is so deplored by Mr. Johnson and the Democracy. In a speech made during

the Connecticut canvass, after stating that at one time Congress had been on the point of admitting Tennessee, he proceeded:

"Then one branch of the Legislature was disorganized, and the rebel element, not being willing to submit to the rule of the majority, sought to break up and destroy the Government. They left the house without a quorum, and it is still without a quorum. And I say that while the Government was in that condition, there is not a man of you who would think that State should be recognized. We therefore do not complain of the delay. We know that admission now would destroy the Union element of those States. Congress is doing right in holding them back. When the rebel armies first surrendered there was everywhere a disposition toward loyalty, but I stand here to-night to say there is now a feeling as deep and bitter toward the Union men of the South, as there ever was in 1860 or 1861. And the facts have proved that Congress, in its cool and deliberate treatment of the matter, deserves the thanks of all Union men in giving opportunity for these rebels to show their hands, Time will show that Congress was right. But all these things will be settled wisely and safely; and when loyal men get control of these governments, there will then be no difficulty, and all these questions will be satisfactorily settled."

If this, then, is the condition of Tennessee, what must be that of States which were defiantly rebellious to the last? It would be easy to adduce similar testimony with regard to each one in its turn, but perhaps the best mode of proceeding in our investigation will be to take up the subject systematically, and consider the temper of the South with respect to the various conditions precedent to restoration.

Repentance.

In all systems of morals and ethics it is a universal rule that absolution must be earned by repentance. A rebellion which Mr. Vice-President Stephens had assured them was utterly without cause, against a government which had never made itself felt except by its benefits; a wanton rebellion which had cost both sides half a million of lives and nearly ten thousand millions of dollars—this was surely a crime to be repented of in sackcloth and ashes. In the name of humanity, it should be stigmatized as the foulest crime in history, and the future peace of the nation demands that the depth of its guilt should know no attempt at palliation. Those who regard it as merely a venial political error should have no place in the councils of the nation.

Among the few South Carolinians who called themselves Union men, the Hon. B. F. Perry was conspicuous, and Mr. Johnson could find none so trustworthy to carry out his reconstruction policy, when he appointed him Provisional Governor of South Carolina. Mr. Perry, under date of April 15th, has printed a letter to Horace Greeley, in which he pleads the cause of his section. Let us see

what view he takes of the secession which he condemned from the first, and we can then judge how it is regarded by those who hailed it as the most promising of blessings:

“And what great unpardonable crime have the Secessionists themselves been guilty of? They believed in that sacred principle set forth in our Declaration of Independence, that every people have the right of self-government, and the right to change and alter their form of government as they may see proper. This was the head and front of their offending, nothing more. They expressed their purpose of living separately from the Northern States! That was all! They did not seek to invade the North or govern the North. It was not their purpose to wage war against the Northern States, but to live quietly and peaceably by them as neighbors and friends. They had been taught by their greatest statesmen for half a century past that they had the right to peaceably secede from the Federal Government. And they attempted to exercise this right. That is all! For this attempt they have been conquered and subdued, their property taken from them, and their country desolated? Is this not punishment enough for a simple error of judgment?”

Neither Congress nor the loyal people of the North desire the further punishment of the South, but it is for us a simple matter of prudence to consider the safety of lodging a controlling political power with those whose “Union” men deem secession “a simple error of judgment.”

If, however, we want to know what are the views still held by original secessionists, we may find them in the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion, which, in an article commending President Johnson and his policy to the support of the South, remarks:

“We do not repent of the course which, four years ago, we entered upon; we leave it to posterity to say that we did right. Why Providence denied us success we know not now, but we shall know hereafter; and even now we watch with interest, from day to day, the unfolding of the divine purposes concerning the country which he has decreed shall be one, though many wise and good men thought different. How singular the turn that affairs have taken, and how completely providential! The good-natured buffoon whom the good people of the North chose to place in the chair of Washington and Jackson, was removed when his mission was accomplished, and the hearts of Southern men, already depressed by the great misfortune that was fresh upon them, sank deeper at the thought that a ruler was then set over them whose little finger would be thicker than his predecessor's loins. . . . If Southern men do not admire and applaud such a man as this, it is because the God that made them has reconstructed them in a manner hitherto unheard of—taking away their old heart, and giving them instead a heart of dirt. They are not the people to give a half-hearted approval, nor if they were, are these the times for it, or is Andrew Johnson the man to whom it is due.”

Secession.

So far, indeed, from secession being regarded as a cause for repentance, it is still clung to as a political truth, made holy by the blood of its martyrs; and the want of success in the forcible attempt to establish it is looked upon merely as a reason why peaceful legislative means should be resorted to in future in the effort to dismember the Union. Mr. Stephens was no original secessionist, and Georgia thought, perhaps, that therefore she was earning restoration in electing him to represent her in the United States Senate. Yet Mr. Stephens could not refrain, in his speech of Feb. 22d, before the Legislature of his State, from asserting that the South had been consistently loyal to the Constitution of the United States, and that having failed in establishing by arms their interpretation of it, there only remained to continue the effort in the halls of legislation:

"Whatever may be said of the loyalty or disloyalty of any in the late most lamentable conflict of arms, I think I may venture safely to say that there was, on the part of the great mass of the people of Georgia, and of the entire South, no disloyalty to the principles of the Constitution of the United States. . . . With us, it was simply a question of where our allegiance was due in the maintenance of those principles; which authority was paramount in the last resort, State or Federal. . . . Our only alternative now is to give up all hopes of constitutional liberty, or retrace our steps and to look for its vindication and maintenance in the forums of reason and justice, instead of on the arena of arms; in the courts and halls of legislation, instead of on the fields of battle. I am frank and candid in setting you right here. Our surest hopes, in my judgment, of these ends are in the restoration policy of the President of the United States."

The ideas, rather cautiously insinuated than openly expressed by Mr. Stephens, are more boldly enunciated by the Galveston News:

"We are not ashamed to confess that we expected the doctrine of peaceable secession to be admitted on the basis of professions which we publish elsewhere in this issue; that we believed the age of conquest to have passed away. Mistaken as we were, it yet remains to be determined whether the South has not suffered for having fallen behind the time, and whether the parties on the other side, both actors and interested spectators, will not finally be compelled to reach through many throes the political idea involved in the course of the seceding States. The time will come when political issues as fundamental as those raised by the South must be decided without war, and the worst judgment then passed upon her will embody nothing more than the charge of having been *premature*."

It can thus be understood why the conventions of the Southern States drew so careful a distinction between repealing the ordinances of secession and declaring them null and void *ab initio*, and why President Johnson was unable, in so many instances, to obtain from them more than the simple repeal. To understand the full significance of this fact, it should be borne in mind that those conventions were chosen by a constituency from which the "disloyal" element had been as far as possible excluded, and that they represented the most advanced Unionism that could be practically got together to work the machinery of their respective States.

Submission.

Had the South accepted the situation in good faith, the unexampled magnanimity with which it was treated in the helplessness of its surrender would have prompted it to make atonement for the past by a prompt and ungrudging acquiescence in the requirements which the nation demanded, not in anger nor for vengeance, but for security. The conventions, however, never, haggled and bargained with Mr. Johnston. Some of his very moderate conditions he was obliged to force upon them; others he unfortunately permitted himself to abandon. The South was not slow to take advantage of his weakness. Its old bullying spirit revived, and the curious spectacle is presented of the conquered prescribing the terms on which it will condescend to share the government of the conqueror. Thus, the Mobile Register declares:

"The South will not purchase political privileges to which it is entitled by the Constitution of the country, at the price of dishonor. Indeed, the South has made all the concessions it means to make to restoration. First, because it has done enough; and second, because faith has not been kept with it in what it has done. We were promised amnesty for the past and cordial political brotherhood for the future, if we would submit to certain conditions, which were hard, because they were opposed to traditional habits and instincts. We kept our part of the bargain, but it has been broken to the hope and insult paid down instead in the other. We have no other bargains to make."

And the Richmond Enquirer of May 4th:

"If the powers that be are resolved to visit outrage upon us, let it, at least, be without our further sanction. Let us stand in our tracks, and upon our rights, and throw upon those who may deny them all the odium and infamy. Such, we believe, is the temper of the Southern people at this time. We have followed the *ignis fatuus* of reconstruction until we are weary of floundering in morass and mire. The representation which would be accorded us, even by those who would allow us representation at all, is really *no* representation. The test oath makes of it a mere mockery; nay, worse, for it makes it *mis* representation. Think of Botts or Underwood as a *representative* of Virginia!

Infinitely do we prefer *none* to such as they. Then surely we have no need further to prostrate ourselves in the dust in tedious and doubtful pursuit of a privilege like *that*. "

So the Augusta Constitutionalist, in ridiculing Senator Stewart's plan of reconstruction:

"We have said this was Esau's bargain. It is hardly so much. For his birthright the Ishmaelite got at least a mess of pottage, and we are to have not even that. Out upon the hackneyed swindle. We have been promised and been promised. We have done this and done that, and we are no nearer Congress to-day than when we began. The resolutions do not offer us, even in exchange for negro suffrage, congressional representation. Nothing but amnesty, an amnesty—if there be one particle of dependence to be placed in the heretofore pledged word of the Federal Government—that not one man in ten thousand of us requires.

"But enough for the present, for we write in haste. The trick is so shallow that it strikes us with fully as much amazement as wrath. Sumner approves it, and so does Wilson; but the one is a tumid ass, and the other a hustings statesman. We do not wonder at them; but there are men of real and genuine ability in the Radical ranks, and that they should permit it is proof they are playing the stake of the gambler when he puts his all upon the throw.

"Shoulder to shoulder, men of the South, and no following after Esau. If these men can force this thing upon us, God help us. If they cannot, don't let us do it ourselves."

The Goldsborough, (N. C.) Daily News:

"As a people, we have done all that a noble adversary would have required of us, even if we have not gone beyond, and we are not prepared to yield more than we have done. The Congress of the United States asks more; the President does not, and, therefore, the entire South, with rare exceptions, favor the 1* 10 President, and are opposed to the schemes of Congress, which are clearly intended, not for the good of the country, North or South, but to perpetuate their own political power. *If, then, we are rapidly drifting into the vortex of another bloody revolution, as many suppose*, let us do such little steering as we are permitted, in such manner, as to avoid, if possible, impending evil."

And the Charlottesville Chronicle:

"It has been suggested that it would be politic for the South to make a compromise with the Radicals by consenting to accord to the negroes a qualified right of suffrage. This is in reality accepting the bill of Senator Stewart. It is urged that we might as well yield the point as to have it forced upon us, and perhaps in a worse form.

"For ourselves we have nothing more to yield, and nothing farther to offer. We do not see what more the South can do than has been done. There is a determination to quarrel with us, and our observation is that when it is seen that a person is determined to quarrel, it is unwise to attempt to conciliate him.

"We would not make one additional overture to Congress. We are opposed to the South's adding one word to what has been said. We would not yield the negro suffrage in any form. Let us stay out of Congress, and make the best of it."

Increase of Representation.

By the emancipation of their slaves, the rebel States expect in future to have them counted in the basis of representation as though they were white men, instead of the three-fifths computation heretofore in use. As a reward for rebellion, they would thus obtain an increase of sixteen votes in Congress and the Electoral College, and this they seriously insist upon as a right, while absolutely refusing the privilege of voting to those whom they thus claim as fully worthy of representation—so that the vote of a white man in South Carolina would be more than equivalent to the votes of two white men in Pennsylvania. Governor Perry, in his letter quoted above, thus assumes to argue the point:

"There is no more injustice in counting them, although they are not voters, than there is in counting the children and women and foreigners not allowed to vote in New York. They may contribute as much to the defense and prosperity of the United States as any other class of non-voters. . . . Who shall be allowed to exercise the right of suffrage, has been, very properly, left for each State to determine for herself, as it is to make her own laws, and regulate her judiciary and police."

And Alexander H. Stephens, in his testimony before the Reconstruction Committee, April 11th, thus arrogantly expresses the determination of Georgia:

"Q. If a proposition were made to amend the Constitution so as to have the representation in Congress based upon voters, substantially, would Georgia ratify such a proposed amendment if it were made a condition precedent to the restoration of the State to political power in the Government?

"A. I do not think they would. The people of Georgia, in my judgment, as far as I can reflect or represent their opinions, feel that they are entitled, under the Constitution of the United States, to representation without any further condition precedent. They would not object to entertain, discuss, and exchange views in the common councils of the country, with the other States upon such

a proposition, or any proposition to amend the Constitution or change it in any of 11 its features, and they would abide by any change if made as the Constitution provides; but they feel that they are constitutionally entitled to be heard by their Senators and members in the Houses of Congress, upon this or any other proposed amendment. I do not, therefore, think that they would ratify that amendment suggested as a condition precedent to her being admitted to representation in Congress. Such, at least, is my opinion."

The Test Oath.

The Test Oath is not to the taste of these gentlemen; they will not even agree to its modification, and will listen to nothing but its repeal. Thus the Augusta Transcript:

"We say it must be *repealed*; for the modification proposed by the Postmaster General, the insertion of the word 'voluntarily' before the word 'sought' in the oath, would not make it less odious, People who have been engaged in the war, or held any office under the Confederacy, cannot honestly take any oath of the sort, and cannot therefore retain any social respect if they do so. The only course that would serve the purpose of the Government is the abrogation of the oath."

Agitation.

It is keenly remembered how all the energies of the Southern press were exerted to "fire the Southern heart" and to persuade the most independent communities on earth that they were the victims of a crushing and remorseless despotism that could only be escaped by disunion and war. We looked on blindly at the time, with a languid curiosity and astonishment, little dreaming of the settled purpose and untiring agencies at work to affect a predetermined result. The same process may now be observed, with what object we may not divine, but we can safely assure ourselves that the temper which is being so carefully fanned into flame is not that which we would select for association in our common government.

Thus the Richmond Times:

"The Radical carnival at Washington, during the past week, was marked by acts of lawless and utterly unscrupulous wickedness which brand the dominant party as open, avowed and shameless revolutionists. They outraged individual rights with the fierce audacity with which the *sans culottes* of Paris once hurried their victims to the scaffold without the formality of arraignment or trial. They trampled upon the Constitution with the glee with which the Japanese are said to defile the Holy Scriptures."

The Charlottesville Chronicle thus characterizes the Civil Rights Bill:

"Under the guise of protecting the negro, they have come in and seized our Legislatures and our Courts of Justice. The Civil Rights Bill is a ring in the nose of every white man at the South—with the string in the hand of any unprincipled Yankee who chooses to pull it."

And the Newbern Commercial:

"Friday, April 6, 1866, will be a memorable day in history. On that day the Senate of the United States, at Washington, perpetrated an *outrage*, in its broadest sense, upon the people of eleven of the States of the Union, in the passage of the 'Civil Rights' bill over the veto of President Johnson."

12

In fact, reconstructed rebels, with loyal blood scarcely dry upon their swords, are openly hinting that all legislation by the present Congress is unconstitutional and of no legal validity, whence the corollary is drawn that resistance to it is lawful. Thus the Richmond Whig:

"Are the bodies now sitting in Washington, claiming to be a Senate and House of Representatives, composed of two Senators 'from each State,' and members chosen by the people of 'the several States?' Certainly not!

"It follows, with irresistible force and undeniable certainty, that the Congress into which they are denied admission, *is not the Congress created by the Constitution and endowed with the power of legislation. Such a body is clearly without authority, and its acts must be held to be of no binding force.*"

And the Richmond Dispatch:

"When the resolution for communicating to the Executive Department the Civil Rights bill as passed by the two Houses of Congress over the veto, was pending in the Senate, Mr. McDougall suggested that the bill was not legally passed, because all the States were not represented in Congress. He was not replied to; but the resolution was passed.

"The question was very pertinent. *It was not settled by passing the resolution. It is still open, and will ring again to unwilling ears, in times to come.*"

And what all this is meant to bring about may perhaps be guessed from a remark of the Petersburg Index:

"The present Radical Congress has done more to satisfy the Southern mind of the *abstract right and the political propriety of secession*, than all the fanatics that ever made a speech or edited a newspaper in the South since the foundation of the Government."

While it is vaguely indicated in a recent speech of Ex-governor Wise.

"You call the cause lost; it is not lost. If it is lost, the cause of civil liberty is doomed, for it, too, is lost. There was a Paradise lost and a Paradise regained, *and there will be a Paradise regained in this country*. The blood that has been spilled is too precious. I should not believe in God if I did not believe that a special providence would yet give victory to and secure the triumph of civil liberty in this country. . . . But I tell you, Old Virginia is not at home. She will come back some of these days, and then the devil take the hindmost. I am watching, and will tell her, when she comes, what has been done in her absence. I'll say, 'Mamma, your children did not do that. It was done by impostors and pretenders.' Again, I say, there is but one Virginia. They have taken and are wielding her powers. If I am a traitor, let them make the most of it. If I am a traitor, why don't they try and hang me? I have lost my lands and property, but I would clean boots on your streets sooner than bow to usurpation. *If I had triumphed, I should have favored stripping them naked.* [Laughter.] *Pardon! They might have appealed for pardon—but I would have seen them damned before I would have granted it.* For myself, the boot being on the other leg, I take no oaths! I ask no pardons! [Prolonged cheers.]"

Revolution.

Some of these agitators, however, are not willing to await the slow process of reconstructed legislation which will enable them finally to obtain their objects in a peaceful manner. The prospect of a collision between the President and Congress excited their hopes, and they eagerly urged him to take the most extreme measures, which would have plunged the 13 country in blood, and created a confusion during which they would either have seized supreme power or have consummated their unforgotten scheme of disunion. From these suggestions we may guess the policy that would receive the support of the men whom the President and the Democrats are now endeavoring to force into Congress.

Thus, the Danville (Va.) Times:

"It was telegraphed here last Saturday that the President had ordered to Washington 10,000 troops, to put the Rump Congress under arrest, and see that Southern members took their seats. But it all proved false. *We think he ought to put the radicals under arrest as traitors, and order the Southern delegates to take their seals with the conservative men of the North.* The radicals are a faction, keeping

eleven States out of Congress that have as much right in it as they have. Shall these corrupt wretches be permitted to keep the South out forever?

"The radicals in and out of Congress, who deserve a calf rope for their treason, are talking about impeaching the President. He ought to impeach them by hanging them."

The Richmond Whig:

"Long before we saw it hinted or heard it whispered that the misunderstandings between Congress and the President would find their probable culmination in armed collision, we had, in our minds, followed it out by ratiocination to that logical sequence. We saw, or thought we saw, by the continued divergence between the President and Congress, by the contumacious refusal of the latter to admit to their seats the competent and legitimate representatives elect from eleven States, and from an obstinate and defiant persistence in unconstitutional measures, it might become the bounden duty of the Executive to interpose. We saw, or thought we saw, how a mere party in Congress, unlawfully constituting itself Congress, by excluding the representatives of a whole section of the Union in a body, who, if present and voting, would, by the union with them of Northern Conservatives, constitute a majority, and throw the present dominant party in Congress into a minority—we say we saw, or thought we saw, how such party usurpation might well be regarded by the President in the light of a conspiracy against the Government, the Constitution and public liberty; and how, with his old-fashioned fidelity to the Constitution, he might feel it to be his duty to deny that body, thus self-constituted, the Executive recognition as the Congress of the United States. We saw, or thought we saw, how that body, still persisting in its sessions, claiming the Capitol, and legislating for a whole country, when only half was represented in it, should, by its violence and usurpations, impose upon the President the necessity of doing what the great Lord Protector of England did. We almost fancied that we heard a deep hoarse voice exclaiming, 'For shame—get you gone. Give place to honest men—to those who will more faithfully discharge their trust. You are no longer a Congress. Take away that bauble.'

"All this occurring, we could very naturally look for the President to call together a Congress composed of members elect from all the States of the Union, as well those of the South as those of the North; and that if the radical members should refuse to attend that he would recognize the Northern conservative members and the Southern members, as the lawful Congress to sit in the Capitol and to legislate for the country. Nor did we see how all this would happen peacefully. We supposed that the radical and sectional Congress would continue its sessions, appeal to the people and proceed to muster an army, if the United States army should not side with it. We also supposed that the President would be prepared to meet force with force."

The Richmond Enquirer:

"It is evident, indeed, that a violent collision between the Congress and the President is inevitable, and is imminent, if the true spirit and intent of the 14 Constitution shall remain despised, and its forms abused for the usurpation of power. In this issue the President has thus far been altogether in the right, and has evinced all the moderation. The Congress has been wholly in the wrong, and has displayed a corresponding violence. That the public peace is yet unbroken, is due to the President. It depends on Congress whether it can be permanently maintained; for we take it for granted that the President will not yield himself an unresisting victim to revolutionary violence, whatever garb it may wear, or allow the Constitution, to defend which the sword has been given him, to be overturned and destroyed. A Congress *coup d'etat* can be met by a Presidential *coup d'etat*, and in the collision the hardest must fend off."

The Charleston News.

"One obvious step to the more firm establishment of his Government would be in the call of a Congress, to be composed of the members of the Southern States and such members of the present Congress as are ready to sustain his policy. In such a Congress there would be as large a Senate and nearly as large a House, while with such a body to sustain him, he can even more justly represent the Government, and throw the Radicals who shall accept the issue into the defensive attitude of an adversary faction."

The Richmond Enquirer, referring more particularly to the Hon. Thaddeus Stevens:

"The Satanic puddler of the national foundry grins as he sees the sparks fly off from the mass of metal, that he is manipulating with devilish glee in his fiery furnace. He knows that they will fall cold and lifeless, mere flakes of inert iron. But, Mr. Stevens, God helping us, we do not intend to pass through your rolling: and *the day may not be distant when the fires of your forge will be put out by a thunderbolt from the red right hand of Cæsar.* "

The Macon, Georgia, Telegraph:

"The ballot box is too slow a process as a remedy for existing grievances.— *Let the President put down the rebellion in Congress and appeal to the ballot box to sustain that.* "

And the same journal, on another occasion, says of the Southern applicants for seats:

"If refused admittance, a regiment of United States troops should be sent to put the Southern members in their places over them; though a small minority, radicalism combined could not put them out."

The Atlanta Intelligencer:

"May not a majority of the Senators or Representatives duly elected by the people, and who have their certificates of election from the Governors of their respective States, meet at the Capitol, and, under the provisions of the Constitution, organize themselves into a legislative body? In other words, may not the Senators now denied their seats, and the Senators who desire that the Southern members should have their seats, meet, organize, and proceed to business as the 'Senate of the United States?' They would have the majority, the President the power to enforce the possession of the Capitol, and the people, we have no doubt, would sustain the measure, desperate though it might at first seem.

"True, this would be a bold measure, but Andrew Johnson is a bold man; and if noted for one thing more than another, it is his great tenacity of purpose. He well knows that the people of the United States are with him in this controversy, and that they will sustain him in his efforts to restore constitutional government. Sectional monopolies must be put down, else the President's policy of restoration is a failure, *and the dissolution of the Union an accomplished fact.*"

15

And the Augusta Constitutionalist:

"Cold steel has been evoked before by legislative bodies, and the saints are well enough read to remember how Pride's pikemen purged the Parliament House as they would winnow the Capitol—how the Commons set up a scaffold at Whitehall as they would erect a gibbet in Pennsylvania Avenue—how the National Assembly worked the guillotine and robbed the rich as they, too, would play Jack Ketch at the gallows and Captain Macheath with each honest man's purse. *Patience has its limits, and these gentry had better beware.*"

It is for the people to decide whether the unsubdued temper which dictates these incendiary calls for revolutionary violence is such as to deserve pardon for the past and admission to control the Government in the future.

Loyalty.

The sentiment of loyalty which is encouraged throughout the South may perhaps be estimated by the following regular toasts at the anniversary celebration of the "Richmond Blues" as recently as May 10, 1866.

"1. The 10th of May, 1793: The natal day of the R. L. I. Blues; we hail its return with the social greeting of old and active members.

"2. The brave who have fallen in a cause they believed to be just: While their bodies are committed to the grave and their spirits to God, we will enshrine them in our hearts.

"3. Virginia: Right or wrong.

"4. General Robert E. Lee: Soldier, patriot, citizen, Christian.

"5. Stonewall Jackson: The only unconquered general—the Christian hero whom even his enemies revere.

"6. The Lost Cause. [Drunk standing and in silence.]

"7. The Conquered Banner: Fold it up tenderly.

"8. The illustrious prisoner now bearing in his own person the imputed crimes of his people: Every true Southern heart would suffer in his stead. The God of Truth and Justice judge him.

"9. The Old Captains: Dear are the living; dearer the dead.

"10. Henry A. Wise, Prisoner of War: Unforgiven, unforgotten

The practical forms which these sentiments assume may be guessed from the following extract from the testimony of a Virginian, General George H. Thomas, who proved his devotion to his country at Mill Springs, Chickamauga and Nashville.

"Q. Do you know anything, from information or report, of secret organizations in the South, said to be hostile to the Government?

"A. I have received several communications to that effect, but persons who have given me this information have desired that their names should not be mentioned, and as yet no direct accusations have been made in regard to one person or any class of persons. There have been steps taken to ascertain the truth of the matter. The persons who communicate with me are reliable and

truthful, and I believe their statements are correct in the main, but how far this disaffection extends I am yet unable to say. It does exist to a certain extent, and I am taking measures to obtain as much information on the subject as I can.

"Q. To what States does this information relate?

"A. It relates to all the States lately in rebellion. I think there is no real danger to be apprehended, because the military authority and power of the Government is not only feared in those States, but I think there it is ample to put down any serious demonstration.

16

"Q. Is this information from different sources, each entirely independent from the other?

"A. Yes, sir.

"Q. So far as you are informed, what are the nature and objects of this organization?

"A. To embarrass the Government of the United States in the proper administration of the affairs of the country, by endeavouring or making strong efforts to gain very important concessions to the people of the South, if possible to repudiate the national debt, incurred in consequence of the rebellion, or to gain such an ascendancy in Congress as to make provision for the assumption by Congress of the debt incurred by the Rebel Government; also, in case the United States Government can be involved in a foreign war, to watch, and take advantage of the first opportunity that occurs to strike for the independence of the States lately in rebellion.

"Q. Do you know of any persons of influence being implicated in this movement?

"A. As yet I have not ascertained that any persons of influence are implicated in it: and I will further state, in justice to the people of the South, that I know of some men who were prominent in the rebel army who I believe are honestly trying to become good citizens of the United States. They have been paroled by military authority, and have applied to the President for pardon and are awaiting his decision. They have set themselves to work quietly to earn an honest livelihood in some practical and peaceful manner. setting a good example to other people of the South.

Sharing the Burdens.

It will be observed that one of the objects of the secret organizations throughout the South, as described by General Thomas, is the repudiation of the national obligations. It would, perhaps, be expecting too much of human nature to anticipate that the South would cheerfully assume its share

of the expenses incurred in its subjugation, though justice might dictate that the whole burden ought to be borne by those who had caused that expenditure. Those who feel a pride in the national honor, or whose interests might suffer by the repudiation of the national currency or loans, may well ponder as to the wisdom of entrusting the national honor and credit to the keeping of those who entertain a natural and undisguised hostility to them. In what spirit the South may be expected to assume its share of the common burden may be guessed by the exhortations of the Augusta Constitutionalist advising the planters of Georgia to plow up their cotton fields because Congress proposes to levy a tax on cotton, just as everything else that we eat and drink and wear is taxed to meet the obligations piled upon us by the madness of these “sons of gallant Oglethorpe.”

“To the extent of full three hundred millions of greenback dollars has the cotton we had at the close of the war helped the federal credit—and sorely did it need it. That same sum this year would be a further god-send; but are you willing to bolster up a government which, as per estimate, only leaves you for all extra-crop expenses but *one twenty-third part* of your gross receipts? If so, planters of Georgia, you are indeed fit to be ridden, boot and spur. But if, like the true sons of gallant Oglethorpe, you declare you are no bondmen Hebrews to make bricks without straw; if you say by act and deed you will not give time, labor and money only that the full profit of all shall go, half to the negroes of whom you were robbed, and half to the debt incurred for the balls that killed your kinsmen, you will bring about such an earthquake in 17 Wall Street and in Lowell, in the national bank system and the credit of federal bonds, as will speedily work tyranny's downfall. The great mass of the North are willing to let you prosper if you can, but they are blind to the devilment plotted against you, and need an earthquake to open their eyes. Once wake them, and the Five Cent Tax will sleep with Hector. They will learn that first lesson in political economy that *tyranny don't pay*, and will demand politically what we again and again financially advise, beseech, adjure— Let Cotton Alone.

Reconciliation.

President Johnson and the Democrats assure us so earnestly that the South is brimming over with kindly feeling towards us, that we would seem to be more or less than men to eye with continued suspicion those who are so fondly asking for reconciliation and oblivion of mutual injuries. When, however, we turn to facts, we find them to hardly correspond with the roseate pictures seen through the Johnsonian-Democratic spectacles. It would seem as though those who are clamoring for the restoration of their forfeited constitutional rights should begin by setting the example of according to their conquerors the plain constitutional right which guarantees to a citizen of Pennsylvania or Ohio all the privileges in Virginia or Mississippi which he enjoys in his native state. Simple justice and good faith, to say nothing of policy and common sense, demand this, and yet the uniform testimony of almost every man who has visited the South, since the inauguration of Mr. Johnson's process

of reconstruction, tells the same tale of warning to those who might think of settling there, and of bringing their strong arms and intelligent industry to aid in rebuilding her shattered fortunes. What treatment a Northern man may expect, who will not abdicate his right to his own opinions, may be gathered from the *Memphis Avalanche*, which thus holds up to public execration the "Yankee Merchants," who dared to think favorably of the Civil Rights Bill.

"We warn our friends and our people against them. Buy nothing of them. Sell nothing to them. They would disfranchise the very people among whom they hope to flourish. Their association is contamination; their presence but moral leprosy and death. Let them feel this, and feel it now and forever. An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. They would disfranchise, insult and degrade us. Let us cause them to feel that we cannot patronize the hand raised to chastise us. If any planter or any one else would like to know *the names* of these radical one-horse Yankees, who rejoice every time the South has an insult heaped upon her, let them call at the *Avalanche* office. They will be given at once. So long as we can wield a pen, such haters of the land and people where they reside shall not insult us with impunity. They are *nuisances*, and we shall report them as such on all occasions. We intend they shall have an infamous notoriety, which will stick to them as the shirt of Nessus."

In a recent letter, John Minor Botts informs us how much fraternization we may expect in Virginia.

"Now, if this feeling does exist, why is it that every Union man is sacrificed and every one who was in the Rebel service taken care of? Why is it that if young ladies, who modestly and instinctively shrink from the appearance of 18 their names in the public prints, and who attend a social party given by United States officers, find their attendance on the occasion referred to, in the next day's papers in such terms as to bring odium upon them among their former friends?"

This is an allusion to a case which occurred in Richmond. Some "Yankee" officers, in a praiseworthy effort at reconciliation, gave a ball, which was attended by some Virginia ladies. To associate with Northern gentlemen was unpardonable, and even the chivalrous instincts of Virginians could not prevent the public punishment of those ladies by the publication of their names in the *Richmond Examiner*, whose editor remarked, in vouching for the accuracy of his information:

"It is enough for us to know that we obtained it accurately, and that, too, without getting our foot within the circle *where any Southern man, however weak his antecedents, should blush scarlet to be found, no matter how Yankeeized and galvanized he be now.*"

For this base invasion of the sanctities of social life, the *Examiner* received the thanks "of a large majority of the ladies of Richmond," and the ladies whom it had held up to obloquy were insulted and persecuted. General Terry, believing that such acts were not calculated to promote a restoration

of harmony and fraternal feeling, suppressed the Examiner. An application for its resumption was referred to General Grant, who returned it with the endorsement:

" Reply to Application of H. Rives Pollard, Praying a Revocation of the Order Suppressing the Richmond Examiner. —The course of the Examiner in every number which I have seen has been such as to foster and increase the ill feeling towards the Government of the United States by the discontented portion of the Southern people. I believe it to be for the best interests of the whole people, North and South, to suppress such utterances wherever the prover exists to do so. The power certainly does exist where martial law prevails, and will be exercised. Reluctant as I was to pursue this course, I have felt it my duty to pursue it in this instance; and as much as I dislike to interfere with the interests of individuals, I would deem it improper and mischievous in tendency to revoke the order for the suppression of the Richmond Examiner at this time. (Signed) U. S. Grant, Lieut.-Gen."

In spite of the Lieutenant General, however, the order was revoked by President Johnson, on Mr. Pollard signing the following pledge:

"If the publication of the Examiner shall be permitted, I solemnly pledge my honor that it shall be devoted to the support of the Union, the Constitution and the laws, and that journal will CONTINUE heartily to support the President's policy. "

Thus the era of good feeling and fraternity does not yet seem to have dawned among our Southern brethren.

The Future Leaders of the South.

But we might pass all this with comparative indifference if we could believe that the South would in the future entrust its political destinies to wiser and truer men than those whose mad ambition has inflicted so much misery upon us all. As the Southern representatives, when admitted, are 19 to hold the balance of power, it becomes to the last degree important for us to know what kind of representatives they are likely to send us for the future. On this vital question we have ample materials to form a judgment. When Mississippi elected as her first reconstructed Governor, General Humphreys, of the rebel army, who had to have a pardon telegraphed to him before he could take the oaths of office; when South Carolina came within a few hundred votes of conferring the same important position upon Wade Hampton, in spite of his persistent refusal to be a candidate; when New Orleans chose Munroe, her most violent secessionist, as Mayor; when Mobile selects the pirate Semmes as her Probate Judge, we have evidence which the blindest cannot overlook as to the character of those who, for the future, are to be the leaders of Southern opinion, the moulders of

Southern policy and the mediums of Southern demands. This purpose is frankly avowed. As the Columbia South Carolinian says:

"We vote for the late confederate soldiers because they represent the valor, honor and intelligence of the people."

And the Macon Journal:

"We have a right to elect our military heroes to office. Ought we to give up our cherished notions of policy to swallow a plum?"

The New Orleans correspondent of the New York World, May 21, 1866, boasts of this and shows us how the old alliance between rebellion and Democracy is rapidly becoming again cemented:

"The election on Monday resulted in the success of the National Democratic Ticket. All of the Democratic candidates were elected, except a justice of the peace, a constable, and the clerk of the Second District Court. This latter office is supposed to be, next to that of sheriff, the most valuable in the parish. The successful candidate is Captain O'Rourke, who had been defeated in the Democratic convention by one of the stay-at-home gentry. Captain O'Rourke had been a gallant officer in the confederate army, and had lost an arm in the service. Those circumstances made him invincible. All the other candidates on the general ticket of National Democracy are elected; and all of them had been in the confederate service, in one army or another. I suppose that this will be taken as conclusive evidence of 'disloyalty,' especially as their vote is about two to one over that of their opponents, except where ex-confederates run against them.

"We, however, view it differently. We vote for the men who sympathized with us, and were of us, in the bitter struggle of the past, and we organize ourselves as the Democratic party, because we find in that party the only support of justice, of liberty and of true Democracy. The fact that the old Confederate sentiment—which is the *people* of the South—allies itself willingly and spontaneously with a great national organization, shows conclusively that a national feeling is restored, or is, at least, in the way of restoration."

In what temper these men would exercise their controlling influence when once admitted is not left to conjecture. Senator Garrett Davis, of Kentucky, and Senator Saulsbury, of Delaware, are "conservative" Democrats, enthusiastic for the "President's policy," and have never gone the length of openly justifying rebellion or joining in armed resistance to the Government. Yet, in the debate in the Senate on the Civil Rights Bill, 20 April 5, 1866, Mr. Davis declared that, in the event of the passage of that measure,

"I am henceforth the enemy of *your* Government, and will devote the feeble remnants of my life in efforts to overthrow it."

Mr. Saulsbury was not to be outdone, and openly prophesied and threatened resistance.

"I rise to say, sir, that in my judgment the passage of this bill is an inauguration of revolution. It is well, sir, that the American people should take enough of mourning in every household. There are too many newly made graves for any one to wish to see move. *Attempt to execute this law within the limits of day Stage of this Union, and in my judgment this celerity will again be plunged into all the horrors of civil war.* In my own State—an humble State in point of numbers, but a State of gallant sons—your law will never be observed by the judiciary."

Thus, like the Bourbons, the South has learned nothing and forgotten nothing. Unabashed, unhumiliated, unrepentant, it comes up to us with its old swagger, yielding nothing and demanding everything, listening to no reason and threatening revolution and confusion. It acknowledges only the empire of force. While we exerted our power, it respected us. When we laid aside our weapons and prepared to welcome it, it mistook humanity and good feeling for fear, and it at once resumes its old attitude and its old policy, which the Democratic alliance had always rendered so successful. The Democracy, hungry for the spoils of place and power, is eager to renew that alliance and to sell the country for its miserable mess of pottage. It rests with the people to say whether these schemes shall be baffled, or whether we shall supinely permit the renewal of an agitation which will convulse the country for a generation.

On the one hand are the President and the Democratic party clamoring for the immediate restoration of the South. On the other is Congress, patiently investigating the temper of the South, and planning to obtain guarantees that may protect our institutions and our interests from the evil consequences that would ensue if the Southern members should be disposed to abuse their power. Both parties appeal to the people to sustain these widely divergent lines of policy. Perhaps the evidence adduced above may aid the people in rendering their judgment on this most momentous question.